

cc, JUDGE R.W. ZOBEL

for "HEARINGS A.S.A.P."

EXHIBIT OFFICE 3/7 - 3/10/05
2005 MAR -2 P 1:03

MARGETTA LANGLOIS Phoebe

MICHAEL HUBO-

SAMUEL POLLACK-

ALBERT HYNERS-

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASS.
04-CV-11588

JUDGE R.W. ZOBEL

* "REQUEST TO Compel COURT
ORDERS FOR MOTIONS FOR DEFENDANTS &

FINAL JUDGEMENTS" ON

ALL 3 DEFENDANTS ~~W/HEARINGS (A.S.A.P.)~~

RE: "DEADLINE OF DISCOVERY

DATE 1/31/05 ON REC. DOCKET OF - C.V. 11588

BEFORE JUDGE R.W. ZOBEL

Discovery Needed from 8/20/04 TO DATE 3/1/05

Nothing to Date - O. TO DATE.

3 Def's Have Made Tube + Plaintiff Looklike

fools * Plaintiff Needed "in Discovery"

By 3 DEFENDANTS FOR

Depo's - 3/14/05 9:00pm.

REQUESTED BY Plaintiff.

(MOTIONS Be Set Aside By COURT
Depo's) + (ORDERS for DEFENDANTS &

FINAL JUDGEMENTS AGAINST ALL

3 DEFENDANTS + REFUSAL OF

Discovery (w/ DISCRIMINATION DUE TO TAIL)

MY CASE WAS NEVER FILED TO

D.C. TO COLLECT

Settlement of 6/15/04 - IF

CASE HAD BEEN CORRECTED OF

"Deficiencies" by 11/18/03 + ORIGINALS TO

D.C. 3 Def. Have "NO EVID. NO DISCOVERY
TO PROVE TO THE COURT THEIR (3 Def)

(2)

ACTIONS WERE "ETHICAL" OR TO
 PROVE TO JUDGE TOBEL EXCEPT
 FOR PRECIPITING JUDGE TOBEL &
 PLAINTIFF w/ "PERJURY" AS
 PLAINTIFF HAS PROVED TO
 THE COURT BY 3 SETS w/ DEFENSIVE,
 FINAL JUDGEMENTS w/ NO APPEALS
NO EXTENSIONS BY THE LAW!!!
 ON DEFENSIVE ~~AND~~ ¹¹¹ + BY THE
 NEGLIGENCE, INCOMPETENCE,
 & GROSS NEGLIGENCE OF INEFFECTIVE
 COUNSEL & NOT ACTING AS
 ATTORNEY'S ABIDING BY THE LAW
 & BEFORE JUDGE TOBEL TO PROTECT
 Q's INTEREST w/ MS HETEN
 DAVIS TO TESTIFY — NO CLIENTS WERE
 FAKELY REPRESENTING, Q MONIES ~~THIS~~
 ANY OF THE X-CLIENTS OF AUTO —

(3)

LET IT BE KNOWN TO THE COURT
 I HAVE LET D.C. CHITANTS
 RECEIVE MY NAME, ADDRESS,
 PHONE # TO ALL EX-CLIENTS OF
 (HUBB) + NOW ROLLICK + FLINDERS
 IF W/ THEM —

TO APPEAR BEFORE LIEB JUDGE
 TO TESTIFY AGAINST HUBB, ROLLICK +
 FLINDERS' FALSE + MISREPRESENTATION
 + GROSS NEGLIGENCE OF

INEFFECTIVE COUNSEL W/ IF
 "FALSE, ^{ANY OTHER} ILLEGAL LIES ON THEIR CASES

FOR ALL "3 DEF. TO
 APPEAR IN PERSON ALL 3 NOT 2

BEFORE LIEB JUDGE IN MICHIGAN,
 OR WHEREVER HEARING & DECISION
 3 DEF. TO THE EXTENT AS THE
 COURT SHALL DETERMINE TO "EXTORTION"

OF CLIENTS MONIES TO HOLD UP
 CHITANTS' CASES FREELY
 Before Judge P. HOOD. ^{Marjorie Langlois}
 FOR "ILLEGAL LIEB" ON D.C. CASES

MARGETTA LANGLOIS PRO. SE.

①

V.
MICHAEL HUGO -
SAMUEL POLLACK.

04-CV-11588-2
JUDGE 20/3/03

ALBERT FLANDERS.

FILED
CLERKS OFFICE

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASS.

REQUEST - COURT ORDER
MOTION To Compel By Plaintiff

Set of #3 INTERROGATORIES
of 3 DEF'S (SEPARATELY, SIGNED, DATED)
+ 1 Copy To Court, + 1 Copy To Plaintiff
WITH 2 WKS. (14 Days) By 1/15/05

1) TO DATE NONE ANSWERED BY ALBERT
FLANDERS OR SAMUEL POLLACK OR REC.

#1 OR #2 - SET "DEFAULTS + FINAL
JUDGEMENTS - NEEDED - A.S.A.P.

2) NO DISCOVERY BY ALL 3 DEF. (NONE
BY 1/31/05 "DEADLINE" "DEFAULTS +
FINAL JUDGEMENTS - NEEDED ON ALL 3 DEF.
A.S.A.P.

3) PLAINTIFF HAS ANSWERED, AND
INTERROGATORIES - FROM DEF. (ALL ONE-SIDED)

3 DEF. HAVE "NOT" COMPLIED W/ COURT'S
DEADLINES 1/31/05 - A.S.A.P. DEFAULTS +
FINAL JUDGEMENTS

C.C. U.S.D. A. CRIMINAL
C.C. HUGO } C.C. B.B.O.
C.C. POLLACK } WEISBERG
C.C. FLANDERS } RE: 3 DEF.
C.C. JUDGE D. P. HALL
C.C. MS. HELEN DAVIS D.C. CHIM ASSIST. AS WITNESS
W/ D.C. FILE

Margetta Langlois
2/28/05 pro. se.

for 313 Defs to answer. Above Not in (8)
COLUSION - POLLACK, HUGO & FLANDERS
 Separately, signed &
 DATED.
 UNDER OATH & AS SWORN
 were suppose to be -

How many Times Have EACH DEF
 met w/ ms. MARGETTA LANGLOIS in person
 from 1992-2005? (excluding 2 court
 APPEARANCES HUGO + POLLACK (NOT FLANDERS
 DEF AVITED COURT 2Xs).

2. How many Times Did you HEAR From
 Plaintiff By LETTERS from 1992-2005?

3. How many Times Did you HEAR From
 Plaintiff By LETTERS (in JAIL) 1997-1999 -

4. How many Times Did you HEAR from
 MARGETTA LANGLOIS AFTER PRISON?

5. Did you 3 ALWAYS answer ms. Langlois
 call while in JAIL 1997-1999?

6. Did you file PAPERS in HER BEHALF
 IN DOW CHEMICAL CASE? (NOT DOW CORP. vs
 DOW CHEMICAL?)

7. WHAT WAS "OUT-COME" of Dow CHEMICAL

8. WHY? IS IT STILL ACTIVE? WH. FILED IT?

(4)

"ORIGINALS" WHY DID AM 3 DEF.

"IGNORE + "Neglect" D.C. LETTER
TO "CORRECT" DEFICIENCY?" OF "1/18/03"
 WAS IT EVER CORRECTED?

By HUGO, POLLACK, OR FLANDERS
 OR ANYONE UNDER HUGO?

14) (BEING HEAD OF FIRM)
 ON MY '03 NON-EXISTING CONTINGENCY
 FEE AGREEMENT SINCE WHEN?

15) WHEN DID DANIEL EMMANUEL LEWIS
 LEAVE FIRM — ?

16) I DID NOT EVER SIGN ANOTHER LEGAL
 + BINDING "CONTINGENCY" FEE AGREEMENT —
 DID I? — W/ HUGO? —

A) W/ HUGO + POLLACK?

B) W/ HUGO, POLLACK + FLANDERS? —

C) W/ POLLACK + FLANDERS? —

17) How CAN POLLACK + FLANDERS
OBTAIN MY FILE (WITHOUT KNOWLEDGE)
 OF EX-CLIENTS FILE AFTER "BREAK-UP"
 OF HUGO'S FIRM + DANIEL E. LEWIS?

18) WHO GAVE MY D.C. FILE TO POLLACK +
 FLANDERS?

19) How DID POLLACK + FLANDERS OBTAIN

(5)

my files —

20.) ^{a)} Is Michael Hugo GETTING ON (my CASE?) ^{b)} A "KICKBACK" ON EACH CASE FROM ATTACK & DEFENSE?

"UNDER OATH?" AS EVERYTHING IS SUPPOSE TO BE THE TRUTH
By all 3 DEF — ON REC.

21.) Did you 3 DEF EVER CONTACT DON CORNING — OF MICHAEL HUGO'S FIRM BREAK-UP?

22.) Did you 3 DEF. SEND "NEW CONTINGENCY FEE AGREEMENTS" w/ PROOF TO D.C. w/ NEW FIRM ON CONTINGENCY FEE AGREEMENTS w/ + TO OBTAIN LIEN TO "EXTORT" & THIS w/ NOTICE "THEIR" DUE TO CHIMANTS

23.) Will you (3 DEF) BE ATTENDING PHYSICALLY BEFORE JUDGE DENISE P. HOOB w/ HEARING ON LIES "LEGALLY" & ILLEGALLY ON D.C. CHIMANTS SETTLEMENTS? —

24.) ^{a)} Plaintiff HAS put for "physically" HEARINGS BEFORE JUDGE'S LIES HEARING w/ NEW CONTINGENCY FEE AGREEMENTS DO ANY EXIST w/ PLAINTIFF?

b) Do you 3 HAVE ANY "WRITTEN" "CONSENTS"

"Amongst EACH OTHER" (AND Flanders + "Pollack") (HUGO GAVE CLIENTS FILES OVER TO POLLACK + FLANDERS?)

25) DID POLLACK + FLANDERS EVER SEND OUT LETTERS OF NOTIFICATION OF POLLACK + FLANDERS OBTAINING EX-CLIENTS OF MICHAEL HUGO'S FIRM CLIENTS?

26) WHO WROTE LETTER TO DAN CORNINB TO "OBTAIN" + W/ WHAT PROOF

27) W/ OLD ADDRESS?

28) W/ New ADDRESS?

29) W/ New firm?

30) W/ WHAT EVID "TO OBTAIN" FALSE, FRAUD + ILLEGAL LICEN?

31) DID THE ATTORNEYS AT LAW ~~EVER~~ OF POLLACK AND FLANDERS EVER REPRESENT MARGARETTA LINGGINS? AFTER 3/04?

32) WHAT DID THE POLLACK + FLANDERS ATTORNEYS EVER SUBMIT TO D.C. "DEFICIENCY LETTER TO CORRECT IT BY SENDING ORIGINALS OF PLAINTIFF TO D.C.?" (AFTER 3/04?)

33) WHY NOT? BY POLLACK + FLANDERS

(Especially) Pollack knowingly
knew AS OF 11/18/03 "Deficiency" -

34). To Pollack -

Why did you never 'CORRECT'
11/18/03 'Deficiency' EVEN AFTER
TAKING FILE OF Plaintiff ON REC.
w/ HUGO TO D.C.?

35) Did you (Pollack + Flanders)
EVER SEND D.C. A LETTER
of "New ATTORNEY'S ON REC.?"
(AFTER 3/04 up TO 4/14/04)
4/14/04 - FIRE?)

Plaintiff HAD:
TO LEGALLY FIRE ALL 3 TO
find out 2 more weeks - D.C. SAYS
CASE WOULD HAVE BEEN "LOST"
DUE TO 'Deficiency' 11/18/03
+ NEVER CORRECTED 5 1/2 mo. ON
REC. w/ D.C.
WHY NOT?

36) BECAUSE OF P.O. Box 3091 Hol. Day
FLA. 34690 - EVER GIVEN TO P.C. BY
ANY OF 3 DEF.? GIVEN TO HUGO'S OFFICE NOV. 99
ON ENCL. BUT GIVEN TO MARGIE
IN OFFICE OF HUGO NEVER
SENT IT INTO D.C. OR LEFT NOTE TO
HUGO / OR TELL LAWYERS TO SEND TO D.C.
SO CASE WOULD BE "LOST" DUE
TO HUGO'S SEVERAL YEARS NOT

(8)

INTERESTED IN D.C. ON REC BY
 HUGO HIMSELF
 WHY WOULD PLAINTIFFS
 CHIMANTS EVER NOTIFIED OF LAWYER
CHANGE OR WHO WAS
BEING REPRESENTED BY + IF LETTERS
WERE SENT OUT BY HUGO?
 POLLACK? OF FLANDERS
 BEFORE 03/04 (MARCH 04)?

37) + HOW MANY YEARS WAS HUGO NOT
 "INTERESTED" IN CASES?

38) WHEN D.C. CASES WERE NOTIFIED
 TO AN COUNSEL WERE TO
 SEND AN CHIMANT CASES IN?

39) BECAUSE CASES WERE IN "HAMBLE"
 + NEGLECTED BY 3 DEF.
 COULD NOT BE SENT TO D.C. -
 ON REC. BEFORE JUDGE RECAL
 ON 10/24/04 + 2/16/05

POLLACK + HUGO UNDER OATH
 SAID THEY DID NOT KNOW OF "FAKES" +
 OTHER CHIMANTS WERE - COULD HAVE
 RECEIVED MONIES BY 6/15/04
 ON REC. W/ EVID -

SO POLLACK + FLANDERS STILL "NEGLECTED"
 CASES TO DATE BY NOT FILED CHIMANTS

(9)

CASES "IN THEIR BEST INTERESTS"

TO RECEIVE MONIES DUE THEM,
SOME OVER 13 YRS—

DUE TO THE '3' DEF. NEGLIGENCE
& INCOMPETENCE WAS THE
"MALPRACTICE" OF
HUBO, POLLACK & FLANDERS—
HAVE ANY OTHER OF THEIR CLIENTS GOT MONEY?

40).

HOW MANY WOMEN WERE REPRESENTED
IN HUBO'S FIRM — BY HUBO? UP UNTIL ^{FOR} BREAK
UP OF FIRM + BEFORE 1992-04
HOW MANY? FOR YEARS UNTIL SETTLEMENTS? —
(NO NAMES) (I WANT NUMBERS)
TO BE ANSWERED IS DEMANDED BY PLAINTIFF
BUT ALL 3 TO ANSWER —

41.)

HOW MANY WOMEN COLLECTED WHILE
HUBO'S FIRM — (HUBO REPRESENTED 1992-3/04)?

42). HOW MANY ^(WOMEN) HAVE COLLECTED SINCE
BY POLLACK & FLANDERS?

43). HOW MANY WOMEN HAVE
FIRED HUBO IN 1992-3/04?
(NUMBERS) (NO NAMES)

44). HOW MANY WOMEN HAVE TAKEN THEIR
FILES LIKE PLAINTIFF DID AND FIRED

(10)

POLLACK + FLANDERS - ? TO DATE?

45) WERE ANY CLIENTS NOTIFIED WHERE THEIR FILES WENT IN LETTERS WHO HAD THEM?

46) DID THESE WOMEN ALSO GET 'Am B's US' ALSO WHEN THEY FOUND OUT OTHERS GOT SETTLEMENTS AND YOUR CLIENTS DID NOT?

47) THEY ARE BEHIND PLAINTIFF AS THE BOTTOM OF HIS ON SETTLEMENTS DUE TO HUBBARD POLLACK ON REC.

10/21/04

BEFORE JUDGE ROBEL "NO CLIENTS CASES FILED BEFORE D.C. UP TO 10/21/04 ON REC."

IS THAT TRUE?

48) TO DATE - HAVE HUBBARD?

POLLACK?

FLANDERS?

SENT CLAIMANT'S RECEIVED monies?
(By my own doing) - AFTER I WAS "ACCEPTED" 7/29/04 BY DC.

49)

TO DATE - HAVE HUBBARD? POLLACK? + FLANDERS?

SENT ANY CLAIMS INFO

CLIENTS FROM HUBBARD'S FIRM?

50) A) AND ACCEPTED WHEN?

B) W/ PROOF AND COMPLETED CASES?

C) W/ NEW CONTINGENCY FEE AGREEMENTS?

")

D) WITH ALL NEW CLIENTS UNDER
THE NEW ATTORNEY'S AT
LAW OF POLLACK + FANDER'S?

E) WITH WITNESSES FOR THE PLAINTIFFS -
VICTIM - (MS. HETTERDAVIS OF HEAD OF
D.C. "EXPERT" CLAIMS ASSISTANCE
WILL ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS +
PROOF OF ALL LIENS "ILLEGAL
+ LEGAL AND C. RECORDS w/o
W/O^{NEW} CONTINGENCY FEE AGREEMENTS -

F) NEVER RECEIVED AND RULES TO FOLLOW TO
QUALITY BEFORE TO DATE AND
TO QUALITY FOR SETTLEMENTS

FOR PAYMENTS ON 6/15/04 IS THAT TRUE (HUBO +
AND W/ ALL NOTICES TO COUNSEL'S ^{POLLACK TO ANSWER}

REGARDING "SETTLEMENTS" THAT

HUBO + POLLACK NEVER "ALLEGEDLY
RECEIVED - ONCE AGAIN "PERJURY" IN

FRONT OF JUDGE ZORER -
W/ NOTICES SENT TO ALL ATTORNEYS -

ALL 3 DEF. ARE "DEMANDED TO ANSWER
ALL QUESTIONS UNDER PAINS + PENALTIES
OF PERJURY - TO COURT (1) COPY (1) COPY TO

W/IN 10 Days—

Witness List, ^{50%} EXHIBITS, ^{10%} PICTURES ON REE
MS. HELEN DAVIS WILL BE

Flown INTO MASS. FOR TRIAL BY
JURY ON JUNE 30 2005 9:00 AM.
& Flown BACK BY Plaintiff w/

"Ree" TICKET I HAD TO PAY
25,000 miles TO REEVE

Plaintiff will be looking
FOR "A#3" ATTORNEYS WILL BE
REIMBURSING Plaintiff w/ "Full"

HOTEL (RENT) ARE FOR TICKETS IN CASE w/ PAY—
CAR EXPENSES—WITNESS FEES FOR DAYS
IN MASS. DUE TO WITNESS HAVING TO
COME FROM HOUSTON, TEXAS—

DUE TO AN "INHERENT LIE",
+ MISPRACISE —
CASE COULD HAVE NEVER
BEEN "PROCESSED" — UP TO
4/14/04 (3) LAWYERS FIRED—

Also

If Plaintiff - Victim HAS RECEIVED
MONEY & PROVE "PERJURY ON
A#3" DEF.

C.C. HUBB, R. LACK,
+ F. HUBB

C.S. C. JUDGE D. P. HUBB

Margaret English
TALKING 2/28/05 PROSE:
w/ 3 DEF. PRESENT ON TRIAL